



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

begins to submit, unreservedly, to the authority of tradition; and just as little is it that *lofty criticism* which attaches to the utterances of tradition no essential importance, but that of a truly independent, impartial, and patiently conducted, investigation." To the same purpose are the profound observations of *Martensen*: "As Holy Scripture is the Canon for the *Church* only, it is manifest that a necessary reciprocity must continually subsist between it and ecclesiastical tradition. By the transmission of the Church, Scripture has been handed down to us, and the Church it was that collected the Books of the Canon, as they are in living use, at the present day. We cannot, indeed, look upon our traditional Canon as a work of inspiration, yet we cannot but recognize the fact that the ancient Church had a special call to this work, and that this collection of books,—which has obtained unanimous recognition in the most contrasted quarters in the Church, and thus has received ecumenical ratification, has been determined under the guidance of the Spirit who was to lead the Church, according to her Lord's promise, into all truth. To deny that the early Church performed this task, is to deny that the Scriptures, given by God, have the power to claim for themselves admission and recognition in the Church."

What is worthy of note is, that, notwithstanding doubts expressed here and there, by a few individuals, the uniform result of all critical sifting of the Canon leaves it practically untouched. It was the result of the Jewish search, the result of the early Christian search, by men who knew the use of language, the result of the Reformation search, the "*Quinque libri Mosis*" being a part of the Word of God, and the result of the Westminster search, as is shown by the writings of their divines. Whatever liberty is accorded to the later criticism, it does not yet appear that this foundation of the past, laid by such giant intellects, ceaseless toil, and careful investigation can be essentially affected. While asserting, therefore, the right of Biblical Science to a free, untrammelled and reverential criticism of the historic grounds of the Canon, we may approve the remarks cited above. There is an inseparable relation between the Canon and a true tradition. It will not do in determining the Canonicity of a given book to employ a single rule, viz., the Testimony of the Spirit and subjective application of saving truth, nor to rest solely upon tradition. Does the book claim for itself authority? Is the claim well supported by the composition itself? Has the book generally been so regarded? Has it the sanction of Christ or of one of the New Testament writers? All these questions must be answered. Criticism which has to do chiefly with the second, has no right to announce as infallible, a decision which has been reached without an impartial consideration of all sides of the question.

The order, Prophets, Law, Psalms; instead of Law, Psalms, Prophets.—There are those who would have us believe that the traditional arrangement of the literature and history of the Old Testament must be entirely changed; not modified merely, but wholly reconstructed. Supposing the Pentateuch to have been written by Moses, they are perplexed to find his legislation "followed by a period of about five centuries of comparative barbarism, during which a highly organized nation has fallen into a loose federation of clans, an elaborate ritual with a jealously exclusive official clergy has been superseded by a crude and uncouth cultus presided

over by an irregular and personal priesthood, and the trained strength of a disciplined army coextensive with a victorious nation has disappeared, leaving the oppressed Israelites dependent upon flashes of individual and undisciplined valor for even temporary relief from their sufferings." But their perplexity rests not at this point. It is equally difficult for them to comprehend the sudden change from the "wild and barbaric virtues and vices of the period of the judges to the marvelous spiritual depth and maturity of the Psalms," it being impossible, as they view the matter, for the hero "who stood with one foot in the period of Gideon and Jephthah (to say nothing of his own doings and beliefs) to have composed those portions of the Old Testament which stand nearer than any other to the feelings and aspirations of Christianity." And then, after two or three centuries, during which not even the "faintest after-vibrations of David's harp are to be heard, they are startled by the apparition of the prophets—true sons of the earth, in the freshness and verve of their appeal, speaking like men whom a sudden sense of what should be has startled and horrified by its own contrast with what is, and who turn in all the passion of new-born conviction to force the truth upon a heedless or astonished world." Nor, finally, are they willing that Israel should be without a history during the five hundred years from Malachi to Christ. To be relieved of these difficulties a new scheme is suggested. Instead of "Law, Psalms, Prophets," they propose "Prophets, Law, Psalms." According to this reconstruction the arrangement of Hebrew literature will be briefly as follows:

1. *The Prophetic Narrators*, by whom were written those portions of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, which may be described as most graphic, pathetic and picturesque; e. g., Gen. II. 5—IV. 26; VI. 1-8, etc.; the legislation of these Narrators is to be found in Ex. XXI.—XXIII. 19, known as the *Book of the Covenant*; about the end of the.....9th cent.
2. *Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah* (I.—XXXIX.).....8th cent.
3. *Deuteronomist*, in whose writings is to be found a marked advance upon the legislation of the Narrators. This includes among other fragments, Gen. xv., xxvi. 2-5; Exodus XIII., 3-16 xx. 2-17; all of Deut. except a part of chaps. XXII. and XXXIV., and some portions of Joshua. This code was introduced by King Josiah in the revival which followed the idolatrous reign of Manasseh and Ammon.....7th cent.
4. *Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Second Isaiah* (XL.—LXVI.).....6th cent.
5. *Book of Origins, or Priestly Code*, partly narrative, chiefly legislative, marked by two characteristics, love of system, and devotion to ceremonial observances. This includes, together with large portions of Gen., Ex., Numbers and Deut., all of *Leviticus*.....5th cent.
6. *Psalms*; a few perhaps go back to the 7th, but the most of them must be assigned to the.....5th-2d cent.

And now we may well ask upon what ground this reconstruction is based. The answer is, *internal evidence*. There is no external evidence *for* it, while it may be said emphatically that there is external evidence *against* it. This point is touched by Dr. Peters in the "Notes from Abroad" of the present number. He says truly that "internal criticism is proverbially unreliable when without all external corroboration." Two important items, therefore, viz., the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch militate against any theory assigning so late a date to the Pentateuch, and to some of the Psalms. Another serious question is found in the attitude of the New Testament writers. We cannot deny that the traditional view is attended with difficulties which in some cases seem inexplicable; but we believe that this proposed reconstruction involves far greater difficulties. If, however, we were prepared to rule out the supernatural, to deny the existence of

prophecy, to count as of no weight the words of the Savior, there is so much in this theory of the plausible, that we might be tempted to adopt it.

What Kind of a Knowledge of Hebrew does a Christian Minister need?—That some knowledge of Hebrew is needed by a Christian minister and, indeed, by every Christian minister, is taken for granted. The question is, how much and of what kind? It is not the need of a philologist, or of a linguist, or of a specialist in any part of this great field, to which we call attention, but the need of the busy, care-bearing, overburdened pastor. His great work is that of *teaching, interpretation*. That which he interprets is written in languages other than his own,—two-thirds of it in Hebrew. He cannot teach what he does not know. He cannot *know*, in any true sense of that word, the contents of the Scriptures of the Old Testament without a knowledge of the language in which those Scriptures were written. The day is past when any correct or legitimate study of the Old Testament can be made without the Hebrew grammar, the Hebrew lexicon, and the aid furnished by ancient history. The employment of these aids is the employment of the so-called *historico-grammatical* method, and so long as any other method of study or interpretation is used, the true meaning of the text will remain hidden. In this connection it is remarked by Dr. Curtiss, in *Current Discussions in Theology* (just published): “There was a time when, under the stress of some great controversy it was sufficient for a minister to wipe the dust from his long-neglected Hebrew Bible, and with much labor assure himself from the ‘original’ that the meaning which he had been taught to associate with the verse was the correct one. Such casual study of the text is almost worse than useless, because it fosters the belief that one has reached the true sense of the passage. The knowledge of Hebrew which our ministers require is something more than the senseless and painful enunciation of words which convey no meaning to the eye, and the ability, with the help of good King James, to ride over the vasty deep. A knowledge by which one is repelled, and which is forgotten as soon as possible, is not a knowledge worth having.” But now, to be brief, what knowledge *is* needed? *First*, an accurate knowledge of the fundamental principles of the grammar, and this means, simply, the ability (1) to recognize the position of each word as it occurs in the text, (2) to analyze it into the different elements of which it is compounded, and (3) to give in English its exact equivalent. *Second*, a thoroughly mastered vocabulary of 800 or 1000 of the most frequently recurring words in the language. *Third*, a living acquaintance with the most common constructions and idioms of the language.

This amount and kind of knowledge, as all, we think, will confess, *is needed*. But is this sufficient? Shall a man stop when he has gone thus far? Yes; if his conscience will permit him to do so. No man, however, who is in any sense a student, or who in any sense realizes the work to which he is called, will be satisfied with this. And in the case of men who are not thus satisfied, time for the deeper and broader study *will find itself*. In our opinion, therefore, every minister needs that knowledge of Hebrew, having which he will be able to carry on Old Testament study by the only true method, the *historico-grammatical*, and that too, without the feeling that the work is a *drudgery*. More than this may be desired; this, at least, is needed.